

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 SAN DISK CORPORATION,  
8 v.  
9 Plaintiff,  
10 ROUND ROCK RESEARCH LLC  
11 Defendant.

12 No. C 11-5243 RS

13  
14 **ORDER VACATING HEARING  
DATES AND REQUIRING FILING OF  
JOINT SCHEDULING PROPOSAL**

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
17  
18 On February 27, 2013, Round Rock filed a motion for summary judgment on certain  
19 affirmative defenses asserted by San Disk to the counterclaims in this action. On April 4, 2013,  
20 San Disk filed a motion for summary judgment that certain patent claims asserted by Round Rock  
21 are invalid on grounds of obviousness. On the same date, San Disk filed a separate motion for  
22 summary judgment that others of Round Rock's patent claims are invalid on grounds of  
23 anticipation. It is unclear whether either party is presently anticipating filing yet more summary  
24 judgment motions on additional issues in the future.

25 As a general rule, having multiple hearings in one case within a time span of a few weeks is  
26 to be avoided. Additionally, while no provision of the federal or local rules expressly limit the  
27 number of summary judgment motions a party may bring, seriatim or multiple motions ordinarily  
28 will not be entertained absent a showing of good cause. Among other things, when a party files

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1 more than one summary judgment motion without prior permission, or an approved case  
2 management plan that contemplates proceeding in that fashion, it has effectively ignored the page  
3 limit requirements of the local rules, even assuming there is an entirely legitimate justification for  
4 addressing separate issues in separate motions.

5 Accordingly, the hearing dates on the pending summary judgment motions are vacated. The  
6 parties shall meet and confer, and within fifteen days of the date of this order shall file a joint  
7 scheduling proposal for any and all summary judgment motions they each can reasonably anticipate  
8 may be filed in this action. To the extent the parties contemplate additional motions beyond those  
9 already filed, they should explain why they believe it would be appropriate in this case to allow  
10 multiple motions. Likewise, if the parties propose that summary judgment motions be heard on  
11 more than one date, they should explain why such seriatim motions would be in the interests of  
12 justice and efficient case management in this instance.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15  
16 Dated: April 15, 2013  
17



RICHARD SEEBORG  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28